



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

REVIEWS AND BOOK NOTICES.

Linguistic Change: an introduction to the historical study of language. By E. H. STURTEVANT, Assistant Professor of Classical Philology in Columbia University. The University of Chicago Press, Chicago, Illinois. 1917. Pp. ix + 185.

"This little book, which has grown out of lectures to students beginning their scientific study of language, is primarily intended as a textbook for similar introductory courses. It is hoped, however, that it will appeal to a wider public, and consequently technical terms and symbols that are not familiar to all educated people have been eliminated as far as possible." In these words, which begin the preface, Professor Sturtevant very aptly characterizes his volume. The separate chapters bear the headings: Introduction on the Nature of Language, Primary Change of Form, Secondary Change of Form, Change of Meaning, Change in Vocabulary, Change in Syntax, Language and Dialect, The Trend of Linguistic Development.

Now, with the book as a whole, the reviewer is in such thorough agreement that it seems to him hardly suitable here to use space in developing those views which Professor Sturtevant has set forth with clarity and force, and with examples drawn from his own experience and from that of others, not with the hackneyed illustrations familiar to the reader of philological treatises; but there are a few subsidiary points on which the reviewer feels doubt or holds divergent opinions, and to these he would devote himself.

On pages 6 and 8, we find the statement that in early times the Greek alphabet did not take account of the important difference between short and long vowels, and that even in its more developed form it did not distinguish them in all instances. As a matter of fact, the Greek alphabet paid no attention to matters of *quantity*; it was differences of *quality* only which it attempted to indicate. Incidentally, these differences of quality were in most instances combined with differences of quantity; and this has misled scholars into thinking that the Greeks took pains to distinguish short and long vowels by using different letters in writing—except for *α ι υ*. The truth is that *α ι υ* had the same quality whether long or short, and hence there was no call to differentiate them in writing; whereas long *ε* and *ο* were open, and short *ε* and *ο* were close, so that in the Ionic alphabet

η and ω , ϵ and o were used respectively. But at the same time, E represented both short ϵ and long ϵ —the latter being the so-called spurious diphthong $\epsilon\iota$, arising from lengthened ϵ and by contraction of $\epsilon\epsilon$. Similarly, O represented o and spurious ov . At Athens, matters were even worse: E represented ϵ , η , and spurious $\epsilon\iota$; O stood for o , ω , and spurious ov . When the Ionic alphabet was introduced at Athens, E and O still had two values, and EI and OY were not written for the spurious diphthongs until after these sounds had become identical with the true diphthongs. The peculiar writings of the vowels in some of the Cyclades, and those of "strict" Doric, furnish evidence in the same direction; so does the confusion in spelling of post-classical Greek. So far from finding variations of quantity indicated by the use of different letters, the reviewer is not aware of any Indo-European language which in its writing differentiates longs and shorts of the same quality other than by diacritical marks, or by doubling the letter, or by adding a silent consonant.

On pages 11 and 137, and elsewhere, the mooted problem of the speech-unit comes up, and decision is pronounced in favor of the sentence in that capacity. Professor Sturtevant admits that there are other speech-units, and regards the phrase and the syllable as those of next importance after the sentence, while the word as a unit is of very little consequence. This view, while now much upheld, the reviewer regards as untenable (as does also Prof. A. J. Carnoy in his forthcoming article, *The Predicating Sentence*, TAPA. xlviii). The sentence, the phrase, and the syllable are *phonetic* units, it is true, because pauses may be made by the speaker at the close of any one of them; but the word is the *speech*-unit, because the word is the unit which is shifted from place to place, from phrase to phrase, from sentence to sentence, ever taking its place in the sentence-complex which is built up to express the thought. The phrase is the complex unit, and the sentence is a phrase or a complex of phrases. The whole matter is reducible to this: a child, just beginning to speak, uses single words, not syllables, nor phrases, nor sentences; phrases and sentences are later constructions, and syllables are obscurities whose separate entities are revealed later by conscious study under instruction. These first words are not necessarily monosyllabic like the "Damn!" of the infantile hero of a recent work of fiction, but may even be of five times that length, if family tradition be correct in alleging that the reviewer's first articulate utterance was "hippopotamus." But in developed speech, the phrase and the sentence become phonetic units of great importance, as Professor Sturtevant says; and yet they are always complex unities, since pauses may be made anywhere in them after a word, or even after a syllable: witness the recent nerve-racking habit

of speakers in making a long pause for emphasis after the conjunction *but*, and the inter-syllabic pauses—"nine-ah-teen"—of a certain much beloved and lamented American Hellenist. And therefore the reviewer persists in maintaining that the word is *the* speech-unit.

As for differences of quantity of syllables (page 20), it is quite true that there may be an indefinite number of degrees of length; but no language will subject itself to an over-elaborate scheme, and syllables fall easily into a grouping of long and short, as the chief classification. Where a long is substituted for an unaccented short—as in Greek and Latin, in some meters, cited by Professor Sturtevant—it may be that we may draw a parallel from English verse, and support a stress-accent in the poetry of the classical languages: even in English we feel verse to be improved by the avoidance of heavy syllables in unaccented positions, but we do not proscribe their use.

And now for a series of short items. Page 22: even the avoidance of technical terminology hardly justifies the failure to use the term "vowel liquids and nasals," or the like, when the topic is to be discussed; in this instance, the lack of the term, or of a statement that *r l m n* may be vowels and not consonants, has made the subject much more difficult to the non-technicist. Page 36: as a complement to the French spelling of *Schiller* with *G*, the reviewer has heard a German pronounce the French name *Sauvage* as though *Saufache*; German lacks the voiced French *g*, it is true, but has the voiced *v*. Page 38: in the hybrid *evoid* by contamination of *evade* and *avoid*, the *d* also is a factor, as well as the *v*. Page 45: we should expect the numeral *four* to appear in English and in German with initial *w*- (cf. Eng. *what*, Germ. *was*, Lat. *quod*; Latin *quattuor*), not with initial *h*-, as Professor Sturtevant states; *hw*- would be the initial in Anglo-Saxon and in Old High German, but not in the more recent stages of the languages. Page 49: it is regrettable that the Latin words have not the sign of length over the long vowels; particularly is this true when it seems to lead to the derivation of nominative *Pollux* from Πολυδῆυκς, through the intermediate stages *Polduces* and *Polluces*. Now these forms do all occur, if we accept an Etruscan spelling, slightly different, as representing *Polduces*. But we should write *Poldūcēs Pollūcēs Pollŭx*; and then the impossibility of syncopating a long vowel would make it clear that Latin *Pollŭx* comes in reality from the vocative Πολυδῆυκες, with a short vowel in the ultima. Page 50: in *alacer elementum* etc., it might be well to explain that the assimilation of the vowel in the second syllable to that of the first is not a change, but a *prevention* of a change; assimilation may be either a change toward likeness, or, as here, prevention of a change toward unlikeness. Page 54: would **socitās* for

**sociētās* for *societās* be a linguistic monstrosity, as Professor Sturtevant thinks? Even if one regard *fīnītis* from **fīnietes* as a product of an analogy, there remains *tībīcen*, presumably from **tībīe-* from **tībīo-*, with analogical final stem-vowel. The reviewer considers *sociētās* and the like as new formations in this respect. As for *aliter* (page 115, n.), this cannot rest on **ali-iter* with dissimilative loss, since the neuter of *alius* is *aliud*, and we should have *aliud iter*, not **ali(um) iter* to work with. It can be derived analogically by means of the archaic nominative *alis*, thus: *fortis: forti-ter=alis: ali-ter*.

There are a few, a very few, lapses or misprints, such as *cordem* (page 69), despite the neuter gender of *cor*; *höid* instead of *höit* as the New York pronunciation of *hurt* (page 71); *θύμα* for *θύμός* (page 73); Latin *mille* is not regularly an adjective in the singular (page 132), but in older Latin is regularly a substantive, and in classical and silver Latin is frequently so (TAPA. xlii. 74-77).

The introduction of *o* from the past participle into the preterit indicative in English verbs is, it is true, analogical (page 100); but verbs with the same vowel in the two forms, that cause the analogical change, themselves start with forms of the preterit plural containing the same vowel as the participle, and this factor deserves mention. Again, it is hardly fair to say (page 118-119) that the variation of vowels in English *drive* and *drove* "was not originally significant." However the *o* ablaut grades originated, the use of them came to be a definite factor in the formation of the Indo-European perfect indicative singular, and has this significance, unless the word "originally" is used by Professor Sturtevant as of a period antedating the perfect formation. In the phrase *Dis Manibus*, we are told (page 121), there is probably a trace of the adjectival use of *deus*, a use which otherwise is restricted in Latin to its phonetic twin *divus*; yet *dis* is in reality a form phonetically correct for both *deus* and *divus*.

"Etymology is a valuable study, but we should not expect it to help us very much in understanding our mother-tongue" (page 98). Is this true? Perhaps it might be for the speakers of a language which was, like the slave among the Romans, *nullis maioribus*; but when the earlier stages of the tongue in question are matters of record, as with English, French, German—to list no others—etymology is of great assistance. And when a speech is a hybrid, like English, etymology is of utmost importance in helping toward an accurate appreciation of the true meanings of the imported element. How often English writers and speakers use terms inappropriately for lack of knowledge of the basic significance: *lurid* as though meaning *brilliant*, *desiccated* as though *shredded*, *cupidity* as though *complicity*! The present-day signification must not, of course,

be crowded out of mind by that which the word had originally; yet many a time it is just the writer's feeling for the ancient values of words, surviving as a faint connotation in modern speech, that makes the difference between a slovenly style and a *κτῆμα ἐς αἰεί*.

Again, the reviewer can only in part agree with Professor Sturtevant when (pages 165-166) he disputes John Stuart Mill's laudation of Greek and Latin as superior languages because they have a regular and complicated structure. An analytical language, like English, expresses normally but one or at most two functions by one and the same word in any given sentence, and employs position to a great extent to convey syntactical relations; but a language which is inflective or synthetic may express several relations by one and the same form of a word, and may then employ position to convey the varying degrees of emphasis. How hard it is, by the printed page, to convey the exact shade of meaning of *Hanc habeo sententiam*: on the printed page the spoken emphasis disappears, and we must take refuge in italics or in grammatical paraphrases, or in a combination: "*This* is the opinion which I have." An inflective language has therefore certain elements of economy not shared by an analytical language. Latin, it is true, suffers from the want of articles and from a relative paucity of prepositions; but Greek suffers under neither of these disadvantages. Obviously no language has all the advantages and none of the defects; but there may be a greater profit to the speaker of an analytic tongue in the study of an inflective language, than in the reverse process (despite Sturtevant, page 166, ftn.), since the speaker of the former, in speaking, performs the analysis of his thought in an instinctive and sub-conscious manner, and is hence unable to employ the process of analysis consciously and at will. When he studies an inflective language, he must consider what various relations are conveyed in one and the same word, and must consciously deal with them in transferring those ideas from the foreign tongue into his own mother speech, or in making them his own intellectual possession. On the other hand, the speaker of an inflective language will find it easy to understand an analytic language, for in many instances a whole word complex falls into place in his own language in a single word, without any effort on his part. To take an example: the perfective and imperfective verbs of Russian offer no difficulty for translation from Russian into English, because English employs one and the same word to convey both ideas; but there is a very serious difficulty in translating into Russian. It is therefore more illuminating for a Russian to study English than for an Englishman to study Russian, since by this study the Russian becomes aware of the nature of discriminations which he must in every

sentence be making, and which he makes instinctively and unreflectively; but the Englishman merely rejoices that his own language is free from this quite unnecessary subtlety. Again, the Latin future expresses temporal future and the determined future; English distinguishes between them by a nice use of auxiliaries. The study of Latin is in this point a valuable aid in clarifying thought, since the distinction between the two kinds of futures must be made consciously in order to express the thought in English, or—not to confine the mental operation to translation, which is a means, and not a goal—for an English-speaking person to grasp the idea in its exact significance; but the Roman would find no such difficulty, and consequently no such stimulus to thought, in the appreciation of English *will* and *shall*.

But finally, in view of some differences of opinion, the reviewer recalls the words of Pliny the Younger, who, sending the Panegyric upon Trajan to his friend Voconius, urged him to criticize freely, "*ita enim magis credam cetera tibi placere, si quaedam displicuisse cognovero.*" And it is in this spirit that the present review has been written. The book as a whole is so sane, so sensible, so scholarly, so lucid and so interesting even to the non-technical reader, that one can regret only that the publishers had not requested that its length be doubled, and the themes treated with less brevity and compactness.

ROLAND G. KENT.

UNIVERSITY OF PENNSYLVANIA.

Den Oldjavanske Wirāṭaparwa og dens Sanskrit-original.
Bidrag til Mahābhārata-forskningen. Af K. Wulff.
København, 1917.

The medieval literature of the island of Java is written in a peculiar artificial dialect called Kavi (tho it is not, as Weber supposed and as the name seems to suggest, exclusively poetic). A very large part of the vocabulary is plain and undisguised Sanskrit—unless the dropping of all inflectional endings be called a disguise. It is not, be it noted, in any way Prakritic. Along with the language, Indian literature, religion, mythology, art, and general culture were introduced to Java, where they soon strongly dominated the native elements.

The Kavi literature is now preserved almost exclusively on the neighboring island of Bali. Mohammedan zeal has nearly extinguished it in Java.

Many versions of important works of Indian literature are known to exist in this Kavi language. For Indologists, doubtless the most important of them is a literal prose translation of the Mahābhārata, which must once have reproduced completely